

I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of December 26, 2007 (Office Action). Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 5, 12, 13, 14, 17, and 18 to emphasize certain aspects of Applicants' invention. Claims 1-20 remain in the Application. The amendments are supported throughout the Specification. No new matter has been introduced by virtue of the amendments.

In paragraph 1 at page 2 of the Office Action, Claims 5, 13-14, and 19 were objected under 37 U.S.C. 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Appropriate correction has been made to overcome this objection.

In paragraph 2 at page 3 of the Office Action, Claims 3, 12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that each fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. Again, appropriate correction has been made to overcome this rejection.

In paragraph 3 at page 4 of the Office Action, Claims 1-5, 9, 12, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application published under No. 2002/0052910 to Bennett (hereinafter "Bennett").

In paragraph 4 at page 10 of the Office Action, Claims 7-8, and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett.

In paragraph 5 at page 11 of the Office Action, Claims 6, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of U.S. Patent Application published under No. 2004/0049490 to Milov (hereinafter "Milov").

II. Applicant's Invention

It may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicant's invention prior to addressing the references cited in the Office Action. One embodiment, for example, provides in an electronic device that supports at least one language comprising a memory, at least one language data package located within the memory having an image file that contains data on the at least one language, a pack manager where the pack manager is used for loading and unloading the at least one language pack into

and out of memory and where the at least one language data package can include navigational rules for the at least one language and can be loaded and accessed by the electronic device without having to perform a radio communication device system re-boot.

III. The Claims Define Over the Prior Art

Claims 1-5, 9, 12, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett. Bennett discusses a computer operating system having a user interface, a resource loader, and a registry resource database, a method for dynamically verifying whether the resource content of a resource module is compatible with the most current version of the operating system. Upon obtaining a request for a resource, the resource loader verifies that the resource modules remain compatible with the operating system prior to loading a resource from an alternate resource module. In accordance with one embodiment of the present invention, the operating system has a multilingual user interface and utilizes resource modules that are language specific.

Bennett fails to discuss or contemplate a radio communication device and its system operating software or its applications. Bennett is not in the context of a radio communication device. Furthermore Bennett is more pre-occupied with version compatibility than with the ability to perform an addition or deletion of different languages without having to rebuild a radio's subscriber software code (see page 6, Lines 9-19 of Applicant's Specification.) Just because Bennett refers to wireless media in paragraph 0024 or a WAN network environment does not suggest that that Bennett teaches or suggests a radio communication device that has a radio communication subscriber software code as recited in the amended claims.

Claims 7-8, and 10-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett. In addition to the deficiencies noted above, Bennett also fails to teach over the air programming or updating of a radio communication device as contemplated by claim 10. Furthermore, as the Examiner notes, Bennett does not disclose loading of language data packages without the need for recompilation. The teaching in Bennett of dynamic version checking to ensure compatibility does not

suggest adding or deleting different language resources without having to rebuild a radio's subscriber software code.

With respect to claim 7, culture specific information that includes not only font sets, but can also include navigational rules (left to right v. right to left languages) and information its such as icons, color palettes (urgent v. non-urgent color schemes can be different among different cultures). This is discussed on page 3, lines 9-14 and this culture specific information if not contemplated or suggested by Bennett although different character font sets are taught.

Claims 6, 15, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett in view of Milov. In addition to the deficiencies note above with respect to Bennett, Milov discusses a system and method directed to a process of creating and using a medical database where the contents have been validated through a peer review process to produce an extensive searchable base of protocols and links to literature references by a given medical topic. The database is populated and indexed with protocols for both diagnosis and treatments. The protocols are created and reviewed with research evidence, which provides for establishing confidence levels. It is then subsequently categorized and indexed into a database system. This information can then be subsequently accessed by keywords by practitioners from the patient point of care location. Milov makes reference to Smart Text Hyperlinks, but this is not in the context of a radio communication device nor a radio communication device that can use different languages without having to do a system reboot or having to rebuild the radio device subscriber software code.

Thus, for reasons provided above, Applicants respectfully believe claims 1-5, 9, 12, and 16-17 are novel and nonobvious over Bennett and overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bennett. Further claims 7-8, and 10-11 are believed to be novel and non-obvious over Bennett and likewise overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bennett. Additionally, claims 6, 15, and 20 are believed to be novel and nonobvious over Bennett in view of Milov and overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over such references.

IV. CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 27, 2008

/Pablo Meles/
Pablo Meles, Reg. No. 33,739
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 55794
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (954) 759-8959